

COUNCIL OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

Minutes of the meeting held on April 2, 1982

Present: D. Taddeo, Chairman, R. Pallen, R. Martin, A. Sharma,
C. Bertrand, K. Bindon, B. Lewis, R. Diubaldo, U. Comtois,
J. Doyle, H. Fink, L. Houle, C. Kalman, J. Lightstone,
J. Macaluso, S. McEvenue, H. Proppe, E. Raudsepp, J. Ryan,
B. Sahni, O. Schwelb, M. Shames, M. Squires, G. Taggart,
M. Taylor, P. Thornton,

Absent with Regrets: J. Chaikelson, M. Singer, J. Princz, A. Ross,
D. McDougall, B. Petrie, K. Kusano, G. Trudel, F. MacLeod,
C. Langford.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

82-4-1 It was moved and seconded (Sahni/Raudsepp) to approve the
agenda as circulated. Vote: Carried

3. Approval of Minutes

82-4-2 It was moved and seconded (Sahni/McEvenue) to approve the
minutes of the meeting held on March 5, 1982. Vote: Carried

4. Chairman's Remarks

Dean Taddeo reported that the committee that had been struck at the last meeting of Council to look into the matter of registration and course changes had been meeting regularly and that Prof. Ginter, the Chairman of the committee had sent a memorandum to all department chairman, undergraduate advisors, college principals, chairmen of special programmes, deans, assistant and associate deans, the Provost, the Vice-Rector Academic for the Faculty of Arts and Science, inviting their comments and suggestions concerning procedures for pre-registration, registration and course change. Brief, written statements should be submitted by April 5th since the committee intends to hold hearings and to invite people to make presentations on four different occasions. The committee would like to receive something in writing from the people before inviting them to make a presentation.

Dean Taddeo reminded Council that the purpose of the committee is not to lay blame on any individual, but to look at the process we now have in terms of pre-registration, registration, and course change and to make recommendations which, among others, hopefully will be considered by the administration in terms of overall review. Dean Taddeo stressed the point that it is not

a witch-hunt and is not directed at individuals.

5. Elections (ASFC 82-4-D2, uncirculated)

a) Academic Evaluation Review Board of Senate

Dean Taddeo read the mandate and composition of the Academic Evaluation Review Board as approved by Senate on January 29, 1982. He explained that the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science evaluates all its undergraduate programmes on a regular basis because of the requirements put upon them by the professional bodies outside the University. The Faculty of Arts and Science began, this year, the process of evaluating undergraduate programmes, and it was his feeling that it was the University's intention and Senate's intention to appraise, or at least evaluate undergraduate programmes at this University on a university-wide basis to coordinate, in some form and in one forum, what the Faculties are doing. It was with that in mind, after a lengthy debate, that Senate adopted almost unanimously, the setting up of an Academic Evaluation Review Board.

The Chairman said that the Steering Committee had nominated Prof. J. Herz (English) and Prof. L. Colebrooke (Chemistry) for the two Arts and Science positions on the committee.

It was moved and seconded (McEvenue/Macaluso) to accept Steering Committee's nominations. Vote: Carried

It was moved and seconded (Ryan/Diubaldo) to close nominations. Vote: Carried
 Profs. Herz and Colebrooke were elected by acclamation to the Academic Evaluation Review Board of Senate.

b) Committee on Competence in Written Expression - to design the form of the tests of competence in written expression.

The Chairman said that Senate, at its second to last meeting, discussed again the whole question of competence in written expression. The question of what kind of test would be used was raised and the concerns of the Arts and Science Faculty Council were conveyed to Senate. After a lengthy debate it was decided to establish a committee composed of four student members, one from each Faculty; four faculty members, one from each Faculty; and in addition, three faculty members (non-voting), one from English, one from Etudes françaises, and one from TESL. The mandate would be to design the test for competence in written expression.

Dean Taddeo reported that Steering Committee had nominated Prof. E. Raudsepp, Journalism Department, as the faculty member for Arts and Science, and that Prof. Hill of the English Department, Prof. G. Taggart from Etudes françaises and Prof. J. Upshur from TESL had been chosen for the three non-voting positions on the committee.

83-4-3

83-4-4

82-4-5

It was moved and seconded (McEvenue/Méthot) to accept Steering Committee's nominations. Vote: Carried

Prof. Fink reported that the English Department's Composition Committee had met and had passed a resolution directed at the Arts and Science Faculty Council as follows: "Whereas we object to the procedure by which the 'Examination Committee' (to establish a University Examination in written expression) does not guarantee that even one of its voting members is a member of the English Department; and as we are deeply concerned with competence in written expression, and find it essential to participate in the process of establishing this Examination; We therefore urge the Arts and Science Faculty Council to ensure that there be a voting member ex officio from the English Department on the Examination Committee." (ASFC 82-4-D3, uncirculated)

Prof. Fink continued by saying that the Department's nomination for the voting member was Prof. Hill; that although he understood the motivation of Steering Committee in spreading the nominations around, it seemed to the English Department, with expertise in competence in written expression, that it ought to have a voting member on the committee. He added that given the limitations on financing, it will likely be those people in the English Department with expertise in written expression and composition who are going to be administering the examination and marking the examination. It seemed quite clear and logical to him that there be a voting member from the English Department on the committee.

82-4-6

Prof. Fink moved to nominate Prof. Hill for the voting member of the committee.

The discussion continued.

Prof. Sahni pointed out that to entertain a nomination from the English Department would imply that there would have to be two candidates from the English Department. Recalling the debate that had taken place in Council earlier concerning who might get control of the committee and how it would be administered, Prof. Sahni thought that there was good reason that the members from English and Etudes françaises should be non-voting.

Prof. Fink replied that indeed it was the intention of his Department that there be two members from the English Department on the committee; that Prof. Hill be the voting member and that Ms. Scholberg, a senior member in composition with particular expertise, be given the second slot.

Prof. Fink's motion was not seconded.

82-4-7

It was moved and seconded (Doyle/Sahni) to close nominations. Vote: Carried

Elected by acclamation to the Committee on Competence in Written Expression were Prof. E. Raudsepp, voting member, and Profs. Hill, Taggart, and Upshur as non-voting members.

6. Positions to be filled by election at the regular May meeting of Council (ASFC 82-4-D1)

Dean Taddeo referred to the list of names of the people whose terms are coming to an end on Senate, Senate committees, Board of Graduate Studies, and committees of the Arts and Science Faculty Council. As has been the practice of Council this year, the purpose of distributing the document now was to inform Councillors of the elections which will take place in May. Steering Committee will present to Faculty Council in May names for each one of the positions. Nominations will be accepted from the floor at the meeting. However, before such nominations are made, the persons concerned should be asked if they are willing to serve.

7. April and May Meetings of Council

The Chairman reported that there were a number of items outstanding which would have to be discussed at the April 22nd and May 7th meetings of Council. The list included the programme evaluations that have been carried out for the Centre for Mature Students and the Simone de Beauvoir Institute, the whole question of academic advising, the core curriculum sub-committee report as well as the regular Curriculum Committee submissions for the Faculty of Arts and Science, the elections, and the report Prof. Ginter is preparing on the process of the procedure for registration and course change. Dean Taddeo had anticipated two very heavy meetings and it was for that reason that the Steering Committee had scheduled two all-day meetings. In addition, the graduation meeting was scheduled for May 25th.

Given the likelihood of two all-day meetings, Prof. Bertrand asked why this meeting had not been cancelled since there did not seem to have been any items of any great urgency dealt with.

The Chairman replied that Faculty Council was a deliberative body which assures the proper democratic functioning of the University. Senate had asked Council to submit to it names of people for various committees and he did not want to take upon himself the responsibility of proposing those names to Senate. Secondly, with the tradition Council has had in the past of advising people, a month ahead of time of up-coming elections, he had to make Councillors aware of the elections that will take place in May. More importantly, was the election of people to the Academic Evaluation Board and the Committee on Competence in Written Expression.

It was asked if the fact that April 22nd is in the middle of the examination time had been taken into consideration when the meeting was set.

Dean Taddeo replied in the affirmative, and added that also taken into consideration was the fact that if Council didn't meet in April, it would have to meet twice in May at which time it would be very difficult to get representation from the student caucus.

To pursue one other line of the Chairman's reasoning, Prof. Bertrand said that he assumed Council would receive copies of the reports of the Appraisals Committee and he did not envision that Council would do the work that the committees had already done, yet the Chairman had made it sound as if, since six or seven hours had been reserved for each one of the operations, that he wanted the work done over again. Prof. Bertrand doubted it would take all day both days since all that needs to be done is for Council to look at the reports and basically say that they meet Council's standards, or that they do not. He asked for an explanation of why Dean Taddeo envisioned a long horrendous discussion.

The Chairman explained that this would be the first time existing undergraduate programmes will have been evaluated in Division IV and to do justice to the evaluations that have been carried out, it seemed to him that they could not be dismissed after a fifteen or twenty minute discussion. He thought that there ought to be interests that go further than that.

Prof. Lightstone thought that that explanation was all the more reason not to go through the travail of doing the work of the committee over again as that would be a very bad precedent to set in general. The Arts and Science Faculty elects committees, mandates them to do jobs, and the jobs are done. The work should not be re-done in Council. Council should be very sensitive to the issue of precedent in terms of not treating these committees' reports as extraordinary in any way to other committees' reports, and that it should be kept in mind that Council elects persons because it has confidence in them to do good jobs, and it is counter to the whole process of having committees to then spend two days debating their work.

Dean Pallen reminded Council that it was the prerogative of Council to disagree with what is submitted to it.

Dean Taddeo replied that he would not bring out the tapes of last year's debates on the Task Force Report on Curriculum, but he thought it would be interesting to hear the voices that intervened most often in the light of the interventions that had been made at this meeting. Secondly, it was not his intention to spend two days in Council unnecessarily, he had reserved the time out of previous experience, as a member of the community for the last three years, as to how long it takes to debate certain items. If the work can be done within a day, all the better. The time, he said, had been reserved as a precautionary measure.

It was moved and seconded (Macaluso/Lightstone) to adjourn the meeting.
Vote: Carried